Hyattstown, Md. 20734
May 19, 1966

Mr. Arthur A. Cohen
Vice President and Editor-in-Chief
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
383 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

There are several inaccuracies in your brochure announcing Mark Lane's book which I respectfully call to your attention with the request that you correct them in the printed book.

In Mr. Lane's statement he says of the FBI report that he is the first to quote it. He implies he is the first to do so in print. Both are incorrect. You will find it on page 195 of my privately-printed book WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT. This book was completed in mid-February 1965. The first, limited edition appeared [redacted] in August of that year and the revised edition was in the hands of the printer [redacted] the month Mr. Lane claims that he "discovered" [redacted] the report had been declassified.

Actually, no one was first to quote this report, for it was "leaked" to the press. My receipt for photocopying is dated the month before Mr. Lane's "discovery", my book more than a year earlier. And I was not the one who "discovered" the report had been declassified.

Hugh Trevor-Roper's statement that Mr. Lane is "the" advocate is likewise not correct. His exact words at the end of his introduction are,"...the advocate for the other side must be heard. That advocate is Mr. Lane." Without doubt Mr. Lane is an advocate for "the other side", although I think it is less than precise to suggest the other side is but a belated defense of Oswald. Nor do I believe Mr. Lane should suffer because he was the one who received an income from his advocacy, the one who had a staff and committee working for him. He, like I am, is but one among a number. I prefer to believe the motivation of most of us is broader than the defense of the murdered accused, that it is the defense of the democratic society.

May I also suggest an unfairness I do not believe the eminent historian intends in singling out the Chairman, "who never failed" to attend the meetings of the Commission and saying "It is clear the bulk of the work fell upon the Chairman"? This points the finger of blame and responsibility at the Chairman, where in my belief at least it should not point, and is inaccurate in that the "bulk of the work" fell on the staff, and most of the "evidence" was taken out of the presence of the Commission.
If one may invoke history against a historian, I say history will fault Mr. Trevor-Roper for singling out the Commission and its chairman and virtually ignoring the staff, which [redacted] traditionally [redacted] always does "the bulk of the work" in such inquiries.

I do hope you will find it possible to say otherwise in the book than you do in its blurb, for this is one of the most serious subjects in our national history. We should be looking for neither heros nor goats.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg